

KINGSLEY & KINGSLEY, APC
ERIC B. KINGSLEY, Esq. (SBN 185123)
eric@kingsleykingsley.com
KELSEY M. SZAMET, Esq. (SBN 260264)
kelsey@kingsleykingsley.com
LIANE KATZENSTEIN LY, Esq. (SBN 259230)
liane@kingsleykingsley.com
16133 Ventura Blvd., Suite 1200
Encino, CA 91436
Tel: (818) 990-8300, Fax (818) 990-2903

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Proposed Class

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles

01/24/2022

Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court

By: T. Bivins Deputy

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – SPRING STREET COURTHOUSE

DANIEL ALCARAZ, an individual, on
behalf of himself and others similarly situated

PLAINTIFF,

v.

GRIFOLS BIOLOGICALS INC.; and DOES
1 thru 50, inclusive,

DEFENDANTS.

CASE NO. 21STCV42719

[Assigned for all purposes to the Hon. Amy D.
Hogue, Dept. SS-7]

**[Amended as a matter of right, pursuant to
Labor Code § 2699.3(a)(2)(C)]**

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND
REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT**

1. Failure to Provide Meal Breaks Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512
2. Failure to Provide Rest Breaks Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7
3. Violation of Labor Code § 2802
4. Violation of Labor Code § 226(a)
5. Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code § 203
6. Violation of Business & Professions Code § 17200
7. Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code §2699, et seq.

1 Plaintiff DANIEL ALCARAZ, an individual, on behalf of himself, all others similarly
2 situated, and on behalf of the people of the State of California and as an “aggrieved employee”
3 under Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, §2699, *et seq.* (hereafter “PAGA”),
4 complains of Defendant GRIFOLS BIOLOGICALS INC. (“Defendant”) and each of them, as
5 follows:

6 **I.**

7 **INTRODUCTION**

8 1. This is a Class and Representative Action, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure §
9 382 and Labor Code §2699, *et seq.*, on behalf of Plaintiff and a Proposed Class defined as:

10 All non-exempt employees who are employed or have been
11 employed by GRIFOLS BIOLOGICALS INC., in the State of
12 California who worked one or more pay periods from December 7,
2018 to the present.’ (“Proposed Class”)

13 2. From at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this action and continuing to the
14 present, Defendant failed to apprise Plaintiff and the Proposed Class of their rights associated with
15 meal periods and failed to provide timely and compliant meal periods. Further, Defendant failed
16 to pay such employees one (1) hour of pay at the employees’ regular rate of compensation for each
17 workday that the first meal period was not provided within the first (5) hours of the shift.
18 Defendant has had a consistent policy of paying meal period premiums at the base rate and not the
19 blended rate in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512.

20 3. From at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this action and continuing to the
21 present, Defendant failed to apprise Plaintiff and the Proposed Class of their rights associated with
22 rest periods and failed to provide compliant rest periods. Defendant maintained a consistent policy
23 of failing to provide Plaintiff and the Proposed Class with rest breaks of not less than ten (10)
24 minutes per four (4) hour work period or major fraction thereof. Further, Plaintiff and the Proposed
25 Class were not compensated with one (1) hour of wages at the regular rate of compensation for
26 each missed rest period in violation as required by Labor Code § 226.7.

27 4. From at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this action and continuing to the
28 present, Plaintiff and the Proposed Class members were required to incur substantial expenses in

1 direct consequent of the discharge of their duties for Defendant without reimbursement.
2 Specifically, Defendant has failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the Proposed Class the cost of using
3 their personal cell phones for business related purposes. Defendant required that Plaintiff and the
4 Proposed Class members be available by cell phone and answer/use their cell phones while
5 working. This was necessary to perform their job duties. These cell phones were not provided by
6 Defendant and Defendant failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the Proposed Class members for the
7 costs associated with using their personal cell phones.

8 5. For at least one (1) year prior to the filing of this action and continuing to the
9 present, Defendant has failed to comply with Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order
10 1-2001 and Labor Code § 226(a) by failing to furnish Plaintiff and the Proposed Class accurate
11 itemized wage statements that show all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and
12 the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. Further, Plaintiff
13 and the Proposed Class are issued wage statements that do not accurately show meal and rest
14 premiums as a result of the claims alleged herein.

15 6. For at least three (3) years prior to the filing of this action continuing to the present,
16 Defendant has failed to pay all wages due at the time of termination or resignation to Plaintiff and
17 the Proposed Class.

18 7. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all Proposed Class members brings this action
19 pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 226(a), 226.7, 512, and 2802; Wage Order 1-2001; and
20 California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11010, seeking meal and rest period penalties,
21 accurate itemized wage statements, unreimbursed expenses, all wages due upon termination, other
22 penalties, injunctive and other equitable relief, and reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs.

23 8. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all Proposed Class members, pursuant to
24 Business & Professions Code §§ 17200-17208, also seeks injunctive relief, restitution, and
25 disgorgement of all benefits Defendant enjoyed from its unlawful conduct as described herein.

26 9. For at least one (1) year prior to the date of the letter sent to the Labor Workforce
27 and Development Agency (“LWDA”) and Defendant giving notice of the claims pursuant to
28 PAGA and continuing to the present, Defendant has violated Labor Code provisions, as detailed

below, giving rise to a claim pursuant to PAGA. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all aggrieved employees presently or formerly employed by Defendant during the liability period as defined in his PAGA notice letter, brings this representative action pursuant to Labor Code §2699, et seq. seeking penalties for Defendant's failure to provide lawful meal and rest periods, failure to reimburse business-related expenses, failure to issue accurate itemized wage statements, and failure to pay all wages due at the time of termination. A true and correct copy of Plaintiff's notice letter is attached hereto as Exhibit "1".

II.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

10. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over all causes of action asserted herein pursuant to Article VI, § 10 of the California Constitution and California Code of Civil Procedure § 410.10 by virtue of the fact that this is a civil action in which the matter in controversy, exclusive of interest, exceeds \$25,000, and because each cause of action asserted arises under the laws of the State of California or is subject to adjudication in the courts of the State of California.

11. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because Defendant has caused injuries in the County of Los Angeles and the State of California through their acts, and by their violation of the California Labor Code, California state common law, and California Business & Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*

12. Venue as to each Defendant is proper in this judicial district, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 395. Defendant operates within California and does business within Los Angeles County. The unlawful acts alleged herein have a direct effect on Plaintiff and all Proposed Class members within the State of California and the county of Los Angeles.

13. This case should be classified as complex according to Rule 3.400 of the California Rules of Court, and assigned to a complex litigation judge and department, as it will involve substantial documentary evidence, a large number of witnesses, and is likely to involve extensive motion practice raising difficult or novel issues that will be time-consuming to resolve and would require substantial post judgment judicial supervision.

14. Plaintiff files this amended complaint adding a claim for penalties under Labor

Code §2699, *et seq.* as a matter of right. (*see* Labor Code § 2699.3(a)(2)(C).)

III.

PARTIES

A. PLAINTIFF

15. Plaintiff DANIEL ALCARAZ is a resident of California.

16. Plaintiff and all Proposed Class members, were regularly required to:

a. Work without being provided compliant meal periods or meal period premiums in lieu thereof;

b. Work without being provided compliant rest periods or rest period premiums in lieu thereof;

c. Work without being reimbursed for necessary business-related expenses; and,

d. Work without being provided accurate itemized wage statements.

17. Defendant willfully failed to compensate Plaintiff and all Proposed Class members for wages at the termination of their employment with Defendant.

18. As a result of this conduct, Defendant has engaged in unfair competition and unlawful business practices.

19. Plaintiff and all aggrieved employees as defined in his notice letter to the LWDA are “aggrieved employees” within the meaning of Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.* (*see* Labor Code §2699(c).)

B. DEFENDANTS

20. Defendant GRIFOLS BIOLOGICALS INC. is believed to be a Delaware corporation operating within the State of California. Defendant’s corporate address is believed to be 5555 Valley Blvd., Los Angeles, CA 90032-3548. Upon information and belief, Defendant employed Plaintiff and similarly situated persons as hourly employees within California. Defendant has done and does business throughout the State of California.

21. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise, of Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 to 50, inclusive, are currently unknown to

1 Plaintiff, who therefore sues Defendants by such fictitious names under Code of Civil Procedure
2 § 474. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each of the Defendants
3 designated herein as a DOE is legally responsible in some manner for the unlawful acts referred
4 to herein. Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to reflect the true names and
5 capacities of the Defendants designated hereinafter as DOES when such identities become known.

6 22. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each Defendant
7 acted in all respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other Defendants, carried out a joint
8 scheme, business plan or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of each Defendant are
9 legally attributable to the other Defendants. Furthermore, Defendants in all respects acted as the
10 employer and/or joint employer of Plaintiff and the Proposed Class members.

11 23. Furthermore, Defendants acted in all respects as the employers or joint employers
12 of the Proposed Class. Defendants, and each of them, exercised control over the wages, hours or
13 working conditions of the Proposed Class, or suffered or permitted the Proposed Class to work, or
14 engaged, thereby creating a common law employment relationship, with the Proposed Class.
15 Therefore, Defendants, and each of them, employed or jointly employed the Proposed Class.

16 IV.

17 FACTUAL BACKGROUND

18 24. Plaintiff and the Proposed Class are, and at all times pertinent hereto, have been
19 classified as non-exempt employees by Defendant. Defendant hires employees who work as
20 hourly employees and are paid on an hourly basis.

21 25. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff and the Proposed Class are covered by
22 California Industrial Welfare Commission Occupational Wage Order No. 1-2001 (Title 8 Cal.
23 Code of Regs. § 11010).

24 26. Defendant failed to inform Plaintiff and the members of the Proposed Class of their
25 right to take compliant meal periods by way of a lawful policy. Plaintiff and all Proposed Class
26 members have been forced by Defendant to work over five (5) hours in one day without being
27 provided a timely and compliant thirty (30) minute uninterrupted meal breaks and not being
28 compensated one (1) hour of pay at their regular rate of compensation for each workday that a

meal period was not provided or provided after five (5) hours, all in violation of California labor laws, regulations, and Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders. Plaintiff and the Proposed Class were not compensated with one (1) hour of wages at the regular rate of compensation for each missed meal period as required.

27. Defendant failed to inform Plaintiff and the members of the Proposed Class of their right to take compliant rest periods by way of a lawful policy. Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff and the Proposed Class members with compliant rest breaks of not less than ten (10) minutes per four (4) hour work period or major fraction thereof. Plaintiff and the Proposed Class have been required to work four-hour increments (or major fractions thereof) without being provided with compliant ten (10) minute rest periods. Further, Plaintiff and the Proposed Class were not compensated with one (1) hour of wages at the regular rate of compensation for each missed rest period as required.

28. Defendant failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the Proposed Class the cost of using their personal cell phones for business related purposes. Defendant required Plaintiff and the Proposed Class to be available by cell phone and answer/use their cell phones while working to perform their job duties. Despite being required, these cell phones were not provided by Defendant and Defendant failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the Proposed Class for the costs associated with using their personal cell phones.

29. Defendant has failed to comply with Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order 1-2001(7) and Labor Code § 226(a) by failing to furnish accurate itemized wage statements that show all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. Further, Plaintiff and the Proposed Class are provided wage statements that do not include meal and rest premiums as a result of the claims alleged above and/or do not include them at the appropriate rate.

30. Defendant willfully failed to pay wages and compensation, when Plaintiff and all Proposed Class members quit or were discharged. This failure was willful, without legal justification, and interfered with Plaintiff's and Class members' rights.

31. As a result of the acts alleged herein, Defendant violated Labor Code §2699, *et seq.*

1 V.

2 CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

3 32. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated as
4 a Class Action pursuant to § 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure. Plaintiff seeks to represent a
5 proposed class composed of and defined as follows:

6 All non-exempt employees who are employed or have been
7 employed by GRIFOLS BIOLOGICALS INC., in the State of
8 California who worked one or more pay periods from December 7,
9 2018 to the present.’ (“Proposed Class”)

10 33. Plaintiff reserves the right under Rule 3.765(b) of the California Rules of Court to
11 amend or modify the class description with greater specificity, by division into subclasses, or by
12 limitation to particular issues.

13 34. This action has been brought and may properly be maintained as a class action
14 under the provisions of § 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure because there is a well-defined
15 community of interest in the litigation and the Proposed Classes are easily ascertainable.

16 **A. NUMEROSITY**

17 35. The potential members of the Proposed Class as defined are so numerous that
18 joinder of all the members of the Proposed Class is impracticable. While the precise number of
19 proposed Class Members has not been determined at this time, Plaintiff is informed and believes
20 that Defendant currently employ, and during the relevant time periods employed over 50 members
21 of the Proposed Class.

22 36. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant’s employment records would provide information
23 as to the number and location of all Proposed Class members. Joinder of all members of the
24 Proposed Class is not practicable.

25 **B. COMMONALITY**

26 37. There are questions of law and fact common to the Proposed Class that predominate
27 over any questions affecting only individual Proposed Class members. These common questions
28 of law and fact include, without limitation:

a. Whether Defendant violated Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 and IWC Wage

Order 1-2001 or other applicable IWC Wage Orders by failing to provide required meal periods throughout the term of employment and/or failing to compensate said employees one (1) hour of wages at their regular rate of compensation in lieu of meal periods;

b. Whether Defendant violated Labor Code § 226.7 and IWC Wage Order 1-2001 or other applicable IWC Wage Orders by failing to provide required rest periods throughout the term of employment and/or failing to compensate said employees one (1) hour of wages at their regular rate of compensation in lieu of rest periods;

c. Whether Defendant violated Labor Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse Plaintiff and the Proposed Class out of pocket expenses for the cost of personal cell phones;

d. Whether Defendant violated Labor Code § 226(a) and Wage Order 1-2001 or other applicable IWC Wage Orders, and Cal. Code Regs., Title 8, Section 11010 by failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements to Plaintiff and the members of the Proposed Class;

e. Whether Defendant violated §§ 201-203 of the Labor Code by failing to pay compensation due and owing at the time that any Proposed Class member's employment with Defendant terminated;

f. Whether Defendant violated § 17200, *et seq.* of the Business & Professions Code by engaging in the acts previously alleged; and

g. Whether Plaintiff and the members of the Proposed Class are entitled to equitable relief pursuant to Business & Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*

h. Whether Defendant violated Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.* by engaging in the acts alleged herein.

C. TYPICALITY

38. The claims of Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the Proposed Class. Plaintiff and all members of the Proposed Class sustained injuries and damages arising out of and caused by Defendant's common course of conduct in violation of laws, regulations that have the force and effect of law, and statutes as alleged herein.

///

D. ADEQUACY OF REPRESENTATION

45. Defendant failed to maintain a policy informing Plaintiff and the Proposed Class of these rights.

46. Plaintiff and the Proposed Class consistently worked shifts over five (5) hours. Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff and the Proposed Class with timely meal periods of not less than thirty (30) minutes as required by the Labor Code during the relevant time period.

47. Defendant also has had a consistent policy of failing to pay Plaintiff and the Proposed Class one (1) hour of pay at the employees' regular rate of compensation for each workday that the first meal period was not provided within the first (5) hours of the shift. On July 15, 2021, in *Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC*, the California Supreme Court set forth the formula for calculating the one extra hour of premium pay that employees are owed if an employer fails to provide a compliant meal period or rest break. Specifically, the Court held that those premium payments must include the hourly value of any nondiscretionary earnings (such as a nondiscretionary bonuses), and cannot simply be paid at an employee's base hourly rate. Here, when meal period premiums are provided, Defendant has had a consistent policy of paying meal period premiums at the base rate and not the appropriate blended rate that includes all shift differentials (or other non-discretionary compensation) in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512.

48. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7, Plaintiff and the Proposed Class are entitled to damages in an amount equal to one (1) hour of wages at the regular rate of compensation per missed meal break, per day in a sum to be proven at trial.

VII.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

PLAINTIFF ON BEHALF OF HIMSELF AND THE PROPOSED CLASS

FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST PERIODS PURSUANT TO

LABOR CODE § 226.7

49. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Proposed Class, realleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

50. Labor Code § 226.7 and IWC Wage Order 1 require an employer to provide rest periods or to pay an additional one (1) hour of wages for each rest period the employer fails to

1 provide. Employees are entitled to a ten (10) minute rest break for every four (4) hours worked or
2 major fraction thereof.

3 51. Defendant failed to maintain a policy informing Plaintiff and the Proposed Class of
4 these rights.

5 52. Defendant maintained a consistent policy of failing to provide Plaintiff and the
6 Proposed Class with rest breaks of not less than ten (10) minutes per four (4) hour work period or
7 major fraction thereof. Plaintiff and the Proposed Class have been required to work four-hour
8 increments (or major fractions thereof) without being provided with compliant ten (10) minute rest
9 periods.

10 53. Plaintiff and the Proposed Class were not compensated with one (1) hour of wages
11 at the regular rate of compensation for each missed rest period as required by Labor Code § 226.7.
12 *Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC* requires the rest period premium payments must include the
13 hourly value of any nondiscretionary earnings (such as a nondiscretionary bonuses), and cannot simply be
14 paid at an employee's base hourly rate. As with meal premiums, Defendant maintains a consistent policy
15 of paying rest period premiums at the base rate and not the blended rate that includes all shift differentials
16 (or other non-discretionary compensation) in violation of the Labor Code.

17 54. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7, Plaintiff and the Proposed Class are entitled to
18 damages in an amount equal to one (1) hour of wages at the regular rate of compensation per
19 missed rest break, per day in a sum to be proven at trial.

20 **VIII.**

21 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **PLAINTIFF ON BEHALF OF HIMSELF AND THE PROPOSED CLASS**

23 **FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EXPENSES PURSUANT TO**

24 **LABOR CODE § 2802**

25 55. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Proposed Class, realleges and incorporates
26 by reference all previous paragraphs.

27 56. Labor Code § 2802 requires employers to indemnify employees for all necessary
28 expenditures incurred by employees in the discharge of their duties.

57. Plaintiff and the Proposed Class members were required to incur substantial expenses in direct consequent of the discharge of their duties for Defendant without reimbursement.

58. On a regular and consistent basis, Defendant has failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the Proposed Class for the cost of using their personal cell phones for business related purposes. Defendant required that Plaintiff and the Proposed Class to answer/use their cell phones while working as necessary to perform their job duties including regularly taking and sending photos, communicating with other departments, and being available by cell phone.

59. These cell phones were not provided by Defendant and Defendant failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the Proposed Class for the costs associated with using their personal cell phones.

60. As a result of the unlawful acts of Defendant, Plaintiff and the Proposed Class have been deprived of reimbursement in the amounts to be determined at trial, and are entitled to recovery of such amounts, plus interest and penalties thereon, attorneys' fees, and costs.

IX.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

PLAINTIFF ON BEHALF OF HIMSELF AND THE PROPOSED CLASS

VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 226(A)

61. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Proposed Class, realleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

62. Labor Code § 226(a) requires that every employer shall semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages, furnish each of his or her employees, an accurate itemized statement in writing showing the total hours worked and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. Sections 226(a)(2) and (9).

63. Defendant issues Plaintiff and the Proposed Class members wage statements that do not properly indicate the total hours worked by the employee and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by

1 the employee in violation of the Labor Code.

2 64. Further, Defendant has failed to include meal and rest premiums on wage
3 statements at the accurate rate when premiums are provided for Plaintiff and the Proposed Class.

4 65. Defendant's failure to provide accurate itemized wages statements according to
5 Labor Code § 226(a) was all done on a regular and consistent basis.

6 66. An employee suffering injury as a result of a knowing and intentional failure by an
7 employer to comply with Labor Code § 226(a) is entitled to recover the greater of all actual
8 damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred
9 dollars (\$100) per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding an
10 aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000) and is entitled to an award of costs and
11 reasonable attorneys' fees.

12 **X.**

13 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **PLAINTIFF ON BEHALF OF HIMSELF AND THE PROPOSED CLASS**

15 **WAITING TIME PENALTIES UNDER LABOR CODE § 203**

16 67. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Proposed Class, realleges and incorporates
17 by reference all previous paragraphs.

18 68. Numerous members of the Proposed Class including the Plaintiff are no longer
19 employed by Defendant. They were either fired or quit Defendant's employ.

20 69. Defendant's failure to pay wages, as alleged above was willful in that Defendant
21 knew wages to be due but failed to pay them, thus entitling Plaintiff and the Proposed Class to
22 penalties under Labor Code § 203, which provides that an employee's wages shall continue as a
23 penalty until paid for a period of up to thirty (30) days from the time they were due.

24 70. Defendant has failed to pay Plaintiff and others a sum certain at the time of
25 termination or within seventy-two (72) hours of their resignation, and have failed to pay those
26 sums for thirty (30) days thereafter. Pursuant to the provisions of Labor Code § 203, Plaintiff and
27 the Proposed Class are entitled to a penalty in the amount of Plaintiff's and the Proposed Class
28 members' daily wage multiplied by thirty (30) days.

1 **XI.**

2 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

3 **PLAINTIFF ON BEHALF OF HIMSELF AND THE PROPOSED CLASS**

4 **UNFAIR COMPETITION PURSUANT TO BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS CODE § 17200**

5 71. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Proposed Class, realleges and incorporates
6 by reference all previous paragraphs.

7 72. This is a Class Action for Unfair Business Practices. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself,
8 on behalf of the general public, and on behalf of the Proposed Class, bring this claim pursuant to
9 Business & Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.* The conduct of Defendant as alleged in this
10 Complaint has been and continues to be unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff, the general
11 public, and the Proposed Class. Plaintiff seeks to enforce important rights affecting the public
12 interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

13 73. Plaintiff is a “person” within the meaning of Business & Professions Code § 17204,
14 and therefore has standing to bring this cause of action for injunctive relief, restitution, and other
15 appropriate equitable relief.

16 74. Business & Profession Code § 17200, *et seq.* prohibits unlawful and unfair business
17 practices.

18 75. California’s wage and hour laws express fundamental public policies. Providing
19 employees with proper wages and compensation are fundamental public policies of this State and
20 of the United States. Labor Code § 90.5(a) articulates the public policies of this State to enforce
21 vigorously minimum labor standards, to ensure that employees are not required or permitted to
22 work under substandard and unlawful conditions, and to protect law-abiding employers and their
23 employees from competitors who lower their costs by failing to comply with minimum labor
24 standards.

25 76. Defendant has violated statutes and public policies as alleged herein. Through the
26 conduct alleged in this Complaint, Defendant has acted contrary to these public policies, have
27 violated specific provisions of the Labor Code, and have engaged in other unlawful and unfair
28 business practices in violation of Business & Profession Code § 17200, *et seq.*, depriving Plaintiff,

1 and all persons similarly situated, and all interested persons of rights, benefits, and privileges
2 guaranteed to all employees under law.

3 77. Defendant's conduct, as alleged hereinabove, constitutes unfair competition in
4 violation of § 17200, *et seq.* of the Business & Professions Code.

5 78. Defendant, by engaging in the conduct herein alleged, either knew or in the exercise
6 of reasonable care, should have known that the conduct was unlawful. As such it is a violation of
7 § 17200, *et seq.* of the Business & Professions Code.

8 79. As a proximate result of the above-mentioned acts of Defendant, Plaintiff and
9 others similarly situated have been damaged in a sum as may be proven.

10 80. Unless restrained, Defendant will continue to engage in the unlawful conduct as
11 alleged above. Pursuant to the Business & Professions Code, this court should make such orders
12 or judgments, including the appointment of a receiver, as may be necessary to prevent the use or
13 employment by Defendant, its agents, or employees, of any unlawful or deceptive practices
14 prohibited by the Business & Professions Code, and/or, including but not limited to, restitution
15 and disgorgement of profits which may be necessary to restore Plaintiff and members of the
16 Proposed Class the money Defendant has unlawfully failed to pay.

17 **XII.**

18 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **PENALTIES PURSUANT TO LABOR CODE §2699, ET SEQ.**

20 81. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all aggrieved employees, realleges and
21 incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

22 82. As a result of the acts alleged above and specifically incorporated herein, Plaintiff
23 seeks penalties under Labor Code §2699, *et seq.* use of Defendant's violation of Labor Code §§
24 201, 202, 203, 226(a), 226.7, 512, 2802; Wage Order 1-2001; and California Code of Regulations,
25 Title 8, Section 11010, which call for civil penalties.

26 83. For each such penalty, Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees are entitled to
27 penalties in an amount to be shown at trial, subject to the following formula:

- 28 a. \$100 for the initial violation per employee per pay period.

b. \$200 for each subsequent violation per employee per pay period.

84. These penalties shall be allocated seventy-five percent (75%) to the LWDA and twenty-five percent (25%) to the affected employees.

85. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3(a)(1), Plaintiff uploaded a notice letter to the LWDA¹ and mailed a letter by certified mail to Defendant's entity address, which is 5555 Valley Blvd Los Angeles, CA 90032-3548, as proscribed by the Code on November 19, 2021, describing Defendant's conduct in violation of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 226(a), 226.7, 512, and 2802. (see Exhibit "1".) Plaintiff also mailed his notice letter by certified mail to C T Corporation System, the listed Agent for Service of Process for Defendant on the California Secretary of State website² on November 19, 2021. (see also Exhibit "1".) Plaintiff obtained an e-filing confirmation from the LWDA confirming receipt of the notice and a signed green return receipt from Defendant indicating that it also received Plaintiff's notice letter, true and correct copies of which are attached hereto as Exhibit "2" and Exhibit "3", respectively.

86. As no letter evidencing the LWDA's intention to investigate was received by Plaintiff's Counsel within sixty-five (65) calendar days, Plaintiff is entitled to commence a civil action as though the LWDA had not chosen to investigate pursuant to Labor Code §2699.3(a)(2)(A).

87. Plaintiff will also provide the LWDA with a filed-stamped copy of the First Amended Class and Representative Action Complaint immediately.

RELIEF REQUESTED

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for the following relief:

1. For compensatory damages in the amount of Plaintiff's and each Proposed Class members' hourly wage at the appropriate regular rate of compensation for each meal period that Defendant failed to provide from at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this action to the present as may be proven;

¹ Plaintiff electronically filed a PAGA Claim Notice to the LWDA, via the State of California Labor and Workforce Development Agency / Department of Industrial Relations website (<https://dir.tfaforms.net/308>).

² <https://businesssearch.sos.ca.gov/>

2. For compensatory damages in the amount of Plaintiff's and each Proposed Class members' hourly wage at the appropriate regular rate of compensation for each rest period that Defendant failed to provide from at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this action to the present as may be proven;

3. For compensatory damages in the amount of Plaintiff's and each Proposed Class Members' unreimbursed out of pocket expenses as a requirement of employment;

4. For penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 226(e) for violation of Labor Code § 226(a) in the amount of fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000);

5. For penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 203 for all employees who were terminated or resigned equal to their daily wage times thirty (30) days;

6. An award of prejudgment and post judgment interest;

7. An order enjoining Defendant and its agents, servants, and employees, and all persons acting under, in concert with, or for it from providing Plaintiff with proper meal and rest periods, accurate itemized wage statements, reimbursement of expenses, and wages upon termination/resignation pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 226(a), 226.7, 512, 2802, and IWC 1-2001;

8. For restitution for unfair competition pursuant to Business & Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*, including disgorgement or profits, in an amount as may be proven;

9. For penalties under Labor Code §2699, *et seq.* for Defendant's violation of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 226(a), 226.7, 512, 2802, and Wage Order 1-2001;

10. An award providing for payment of costs of suit;

11. An award of attorneys' fees; and

12. Such other and further relief as this Court may deem proper and just.


///

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff hereby demands a trial of his claims by jury to the extent authorized by law.

2
3 DATED: January 24, 2022

KINGSLEY & KINGSLEY, APC

4
5 By: 

Kelsey M. Szamet

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Proposed Class
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT "1"

KINGSLEY & KINGSLEY

| L A W Y E R S |

November 19, 2021

LABOR & WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT AGENCY
Attn. PAGA Administrator
1515 Clay Street, Ste. 801
Oakland, CA 94612
Via Electronic Submission: <https://dir.tfaforms.net/308>

Grifols Biologicals Inc.
5555 Valley Blvd
Los Angeles, CA 90032-3548
Via USPS Certified Mailing # 7020 0640 0002 1439 7861

Grifols Biologicals Inc.
c/o Agent for Service of Process
C T Corporation System
330 N Brand Blvd Ste 700
Glendale, CA 91203
Via USPS Certified Mailing # 7020 0640 0002 1439 7854

Re: Daniel Alcaraz v. Grifols Biologicals Inc.
California Labor Code § 2699 Penalties

Gentlepersons:

This office represents Daniel Alcaraz (“Plaintiff”) and a proposed group of current and former employees working for GRIFOLS BIOLOGICALS INC. (“Defendant”) in the State of California. The purpose of this letter is to comply with the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, pursuant to California Labor Code § 2698, *et. seq.* We herein set forth the facts and theories of California Labor Code violations which we allege Defendant engaged in with respect to Plaintiff and all of Defendant’s aggrieved employees.

Plaintiff wishes to bring a representative action on behalf of himself and the State of California as well as on behalf of a group of aggrieved employees defined as: All non-exempt employees who are employed or have been employed by GRIFOLS BIOLOGICALS INC., in the State of California who worked one or more pay periods since one (1) year prior to the date of this letter and continuing to the present plus any additional time during which the statutes of limitation for the causes of action herein were tolled pursuant to Emergency Rule 9 of the California Rules of Court, the ‘Emergency Rules Related to COVID-19’. (“aggrieved employees”).

Any limitations period referenced in this letter is extended pursuant to Emergency Rule 9 (a) of the “Emergency Rules Related to COVID-19,” Appendix I to the California Rules of Court, adopted effective April 6, 2020, which provides that the statutes of limitation that exceed 180 days

LABOR & WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

California Labor Code §2699 Penalties

November 19, 2021

Page 2 of 4

for civil actions are tolled from April 6, 2020 until October 1, 2020 [“Notwithstanding any other law, the statutes of limitations and repose for civil causes of action that exceed 180 days are tolled from April 6, 2020 until October 1, 2020.”] Any reference to the relevant time period or statute of limitations referenced in this letter is extended into the past by the number of days in which this tolling was in effect.

Defendant has engaged in practices that violate Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 with respect to Plaintiff and all aggrieved employees. Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 require an employer to pay an additional hour of compensation for each meal period the employer fails to provide. Employees are entitled to a first meal period of at least thirty (30) minutes for shifts over five (5) hours, to be provided within the first five (5) hours of the shift. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(c), if an employer fails to provide an employee with a lawful meal period, the employer must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of compensation for each workday that a thirty (30) minute uninterrupted meal period was not provided, was not provided in full, or was not provided in a timely manner.

Defendant failed to apprise Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees of their rights associated with meal periods and failed to provide timely and compliant meal periods. In addition, Defendant has had a consistent policy of: (1) failing to provide Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees timely and compliant meal periods of at least 30 minutes in length; and (2) failing to pay such employees one (1) hour of pay at the employees’ regular rate of compensation for each workday that the complaint meal period was not provided.

Very recently, on July 15, 2021, in *Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC*, the California Supreme Court set forth the formula for calculating the one extra hour of premium pay that employees are owed if an employer fails to provide a compliant meal period or rest break. Specifically, the Court held that those premium payments must include the hourly value of any nondiscretionary earnings (such as such as a shift differentials), and cannot simply be paid at an employee’s base hourly rate. Here, when meal period premiums are provided, Defendant has had a consistent policy of paying meal period premiums at the base rate and not the blended rate that includes all shift differentials (or other non-discretionary compensation) in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512.

Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7 and Wage Order 1-2001, Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees with rest breaks of not less than ten (10) minutes per four (4) hour work period or major fraction thereof. Defendant failed to maintain a policy informing Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees of this right. Plaintiff and all aggrieved employees have been required to work four-hour increments (or major fractions thereof) without being provided with all required ten (10) minute rest periods. As such, Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff and the Proposed Class with compliant rest periods. Further, Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees were not compensated with one (1) hour of wages at the regular rate of compensation for each missed rest period in violation of *Ferra*. As discussed above, *Ferra* requires the rest period premium payments must include the hourly value of any nondiscretionary earnings (such as a shift differentials), and cannot simply be paid at an employee’s base hourly rate. As with meal period premiums, Defendant maintains a consistent

LABOR & WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

California Labor Code §2699 Penalties

November 19, 2021

Page 3 of 4

policy of paying rest period premiums at the base rate and not the blended rate that includes all shift differentials (or other non-discretionary compensation) in violation of the Labor Code.

Labor Code § 2802 provides that an employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties. Defendant has failed to reimburse Plaintiff and aggrieved employees the cost of using their personal cell phones for business related purposes. Defendant required that Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees to answer/use their cell phones while working as necessary to perform their job duties including regularly taking and sending photos, communicating with other departments, and being available by cell phone. These cell phones were not provided by Defendant and Defendant failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees for the costs associated with using these personal cell phones.

Defendant also engaged in a practice of failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements in violation of Labor Code § 226(a). Labor Code §226(a) requires that every employer shall semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages, furnish each of his or her employees, an accurate itemized statement in writing showing the total hours worked by the employee and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. Sections 226(a)(2) and (9). Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees are furnished wage statements that do not accurately show the total hours worked by the employee and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. Further, Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees are issued wage statements that do not accurately show meal and rest premiums as a result of the claims alleged above and when they are provided, they are not provided at the proper rate. As such, Plaintiff is an aggrieved employee within the meaning of PAGA and Defendant has violated Labor Code §226(a) with respect to Plaintiff and all aggrieved employees.

Labor Code § 203 provides that if “an employer willfully fails to pay...any wages of an employee who is discharged or who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefor is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than 30 days.” Here, Plaintiff and all aggrieved employees were not paid all wages due upon their separation from Defendant’s employ. As such, Plaintiff is an aggrieved employee and Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and all aggrieved employees all wages due at the time of termination or within seventy-two (72) hours of their resignation, and have failed to pay those sums for thirty (30) days thereafter in violation of Labor Code §203.

We are constrained to move forward with the filing of this complaint alleging causes of action pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 226(a), 226.7, 512, and 2802 with or without the PAGA claim. Thus, any action by the LWDA would not resolve the entirety of the case, and the interest of judicial economy will be served by allowing the case to proceed as a cohesive whole.

LABOR & WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

California Labor Code §2699 Penalties

November 19, 2021

Page **4** of **4**

Very truly yours,

KINGSLEY & KINGSLEY, APC

By: _____

Kelsey M. Szamet

KMS/km

CC: 1. Abramson Labor Group 3580 Wilshire Blvd Ste 1260 Los Angeles, CA 90010-2513 via Electronic
Mail Transmission: wza@abramsonlabor.com; dani@abramsonlabor.com

EXHIBIT "2"



State of California

Labor and Workforce Development Agency /
Department of Industrial Relations

Private Attorneys General Act (PAGA) – Filing

New PAGA Claim Notice

Your Information (Person Who is Filing)

Your First Name *

Kelsey

Your Last Name *

Szamet

Firm Name (if any) *

Kingsley & Kingsley, APC

(Enter "in pro per" if you are representing yourself)

Your Email Address *

service@kingsleykingsley.c

Your Street Name, Number and Suite/Apt *

16133 Ventura Blvd., Ste 1

Your Mobile Phone Number

8189908300

Your City *

Encino

Your Work Phone Number

Your State *

California ▼

Your Zip/Postal Code *

91436

Plaintiff Information

Plaintiff/Aggrieved Employee Name *

Daniel Alcaraz

Plaintiff/Aggrieved Employee Occupation *

non-exempt employee

[Add Additional Plaintiffs](#)

Employer Information

Employer Entity Type

Please select... ▼

Employer Name *

Grifols Biologicals Inc.

Maximum 80 Character Limit

Employer Street Name, Number and Suite/Apt *

Employer City *

Employer State ***Employer Zip/Postal Code *****Employer Industry *****Employer Industry for "Other" *****Add additional defendants**☒ Add any entity other than an individual☐ Add an individual/sole proprietor employer**Additional Employer Information (Corporation/General Partnership)****Employer Entity Type****Employer Name ***

Maximum 80 Character Limit

Employer Street Name, Number and Suite/Apt ***Employer City *****Employer State *****Employer Zip/Postal Code *****Employer Industry *****Employer Industry for "Other" ***[Add Additional Employers](#)**Notice General Information****Estimated Number of Employees Impacted by Violations ***

Notice Violations – Check All that Apply ***Child Labor – Specify Ages**

- ☐ Child Labor
- ☐ Misclassification Employee Classified as Contractor
- ☐ Misclassification NonExempt Classified as Exempt
- ☐ Minimum Wage
- ☐ Overtime
- ☐ Not paid for all hours worked
- ☒ Not paid wages due on termination
- ☐ Other Unpaid Wages
- ☐ Tips or Gratuities
- ☒ Payment or Reimbursement of Employee Expenses
- ☐ Improper Form of Payment Including NSF Checks
- ☐ Kickbacks
- ☒ Meal and Rest Breaks
- ☐ Sick Leave
- ☐ Lactation Accommodation (Labor Code 1030–1033)
- ☐ Not providing required time off, other
- ☐ Pay Discrimination on basis of sex, (Labor Code 1197.5)
- ☐ No Wage Statements
- ☒ Improper or Incomplete Wage Statements
- ☐ Other Notice or Posting or Recordkeeping
- ☐ Public Works (Labor Code 1720 – 1815)
- ☐ Apprenticeship (Labor Code 3070 – 3098)
- ☐ Occupational Safety and Health (Labor Code 6300 et seq)
- ☐ No Workers' Compensation
- ☐ Licensing, Registration, or Permit
- ☐ Unfair Immigration Activities
- ☐ Agricultural Labor Relations
- ☐ Industrial Homework
- ☐ Retaliation for Protected Status or Activity (Specify)
- ☐ Other

PAGA Claim Type – Check All that Apply *

- ☒ Notice asserts one or more Labor Code violations listed in Labor Code 2699.5– not curable subject to 2699.3(a)
- ☐ Notice asserts one or more OSHA violations subject to requirements of 2699.3(b)
- ☐ Includes one or more violations not listed in Labor Code 2699.5 – curable subject to 2699.3(c)

Filing Fee

A filing fee of \$75 is required to file a new PAGA claim notice.

IFP

☐ I wish to claim In Forma Pauperis and am attaching a Confidential Request to Waive Court Fees (Judicial Council Court Form FW-001) or similar form to this submission.

Billing information

Billing First Name *

Eric

Billing Last Name *

Kingsley

Billing Email *

service@kingsleykingsley.c

Billing Phone

8189908300

Billing Street Name, Number and Suite/Apt *

16133 Ventura Blvd., Suite 1200

Billing City *

Encino

Billing State *

California

Billing Zip/Postal Code *

91436

Credit Card Type *

[REDACTED] ▼

Credit Card Number *

[REDACTED]

CVV Number *

[REDACTED]

Credit Card Expiration Month *

[REDACTED]

mm

Credit Card Expiration Year *

[REDACTED]

yyyy

Notice and Other Attachments

PAGA Claim Notice (must be a .pdf) *

 LWDA Letter- G...icals Inc.pdf

Other Attachment – (if any) (must be a .pdf)

 No file chosen[Add Another Attachment](#)

Should you have questions regarding this online form, please contact PAGAInfo@dir.ca.gov

IMPORTANT NOTICE OF REDACTION RESPONSIBILITY: All filers must redact: Social Security or taxpayer identification numbers; personal addresses, personal telephone numbers, personal email addresses, dates of birth; names of minor children; & financial account numbers. This requirement applies to all documents, including attachments.

☒ **I understand that, if I file, I must comply with the redaction rules consistent with this notice.**

[Previous Page](#)[Submit](#)

Thank you. If you provided an email address with your submission, a confirmation regarding your submission will be emailed to you. Otherwise, you can search for the case to verify that your submission was properly received.

[Click Here](#) to Search Case

From: noreply@salesforce.com on behalf of LWDA DO NOT REPLY
<lwdadonotreply@dir.ca.gov>
Sent: Friday, November 19, 2021 1:34 PM
To: Service Email
Subject: Thank you for submission of your PAGA Case.

External Email!

11/19/2021

LWDA Case No. LWDA-CM-852964-21
Law Firm : Kingsley & Kingsley, APC
Plaintiff Name : Daniel Alcaraz
Employer: Grifols Biologicals Inc.
Filing Fee : \$75.00
IFP Claimed : No

Item submitted: Initial PAGA Notice

Thank you for your submission to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency. Please make a note of the LWDA Case No. above as you may need this number for future reference when filing any subsequent documents for this Case.

If you have questions or concerns regarding this submission or your case, please send an email to pagainfo@dir.ca.gov.

DIR PAGA Unit on behalf of
Labor and Workforce Development Agency

Website:

https://nam10.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Flabor.ca.gov%2FPrivate_Attorneys_General_Act.htm&data=04%7C01%7CKimberly%40kingsleykingsley.com%7C14ccd271d943472be5b308d9aba454b0%7C121a7875dbeb4c0fb25c5baf6c6ac7a5%7C0%7C0%7C637729544558449251%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ikh1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=GS5P7dbD1yPVvGPd6g1TJRLB62EppDg5rAp73ka%2BXpY%3D&reserved=0

From: noreply@salesforce.com on behalf of LWDA DO NOT REPLY
<lwdadonotreply@dir.ca.gov>
Sent: Friday, November 19, 2021 1:34 PM
To: Service Email
Subject: State of California - Department of Industrial Relations Customer Receipt / Purchase Confirmation

External Email!

Thank you for your payment.

Order Information

Merchant: State of California - Department of Industrial Relations

Case Number: LWDA-CM-852964-21

Order Number: ORD-000143271

Total:\$75.00

Card Type: XXXXXXXXXX

Date: 11/19/2021

Billing Information

Name: Eric Kingsley

Email: service@kingsleykingsley.com

Billing Address:

16133 Ventura Blvd., Suite 1200

Encino, California

91436

EXHIBIT "3"

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION

- Complete items 1, 2, and 3.
- Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.
- Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.

1. Article Addressed to:

Grifols Biologicals Inc.
5555 Valley Blvd
Los Angeles, CA 90032-3548



9590 9402 7019 1225 1722 70

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

7020 0640 0002 1439 7861

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

A. Signature

X

☐ Agent☐ Addressee

B. Received by (Printed Name)


C. Date of Delivery

D. Is delivery address different from item 1? ☐ Yes
If YES, enter delivery address below: ☒ No

3. Service Type

- | | |
|--|---|
| ☐ Adult Signature | ☐ Priority Mail Express® |
| ☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery | ☐ Registered Mail™ |
| ☒ Certified Mail® | ☐ Registered Mail Restricted Delivery |
| ☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery | ☐ Signature Confirmation™ |
| ☐ Collect on Delivery | ☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery |
| ☐ Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery | |
| ☐ Insured Mail | |
| ☐ Insured Mail Restricted Delivery (over \$500) | |

USPS TRACKING#



First-Class Mail
Postage & Fees Paid
USPS
Permit No. G-10

9590 9402 7019 1225 1722 70

United States
Postal Service

• Sender: Please print your name, address, and ZIP+4® in this box •

KINGSLEY & KINGSLEY
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
CITY NATIONAL BANK BUILDING
16133 VENTURA BOULEVARD, SUITE 1200
ENCINO, CALIFORNIA 91436

PAGA LETTER
GRIFOLS BIOLOGICALS INC.

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION

- Complete Items 1, 2, and 3.
- Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.
- Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.

1. Article Addressed to:

Grifols Biologicals Inc.
c/o Agent for Service of Process
C T Corporation System
330 N Brand Blvd Ste 700
Glendale, CA 91203



9590 9402 7019 1225 1722 63

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

7020 0640 0002 1439 7854

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY**A. Signature****X**☐ Agent☐ Addressee**B. Received by (Printed Name)****C. Date of Delivery**

D. Is delivery address different from item 1? ☐ Yes
If YES, enter delivery address below: ☒ No

NOV 29 2021

Delivery Service

3. Service Type

- | | |
|--|---|
| ☐ Adult Signature | ☐ Priority Mail Express® |
| ☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery | ☐ Registered Mail™ |
| ☒ Certified Mail® | ☐ Registered Mail Restricted Delivery |
| ☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery | ☐ Signature Confirmation™ |
| ☐ Collect on Delivery | ☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery |
| ☐ Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery | |
| ☐ Insured Mail | |
| ☐ Insured Mail Restricted Delivery (over \$500) | |

USPS TRACKING #



9590 9402 7019 1225 1722 63

First-Class Mail
Postage & Fees Paid
USPS
Permit No. G-10

United States
Postal Service

• Sender: Please print your name, address, and ZIP+4® in this box •

KINGSLEY & KINGSLEY

A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
CITY NATIONAL BANK BUILDING
16133 VENTURA BOULEVARD, SUITE 1200
ENCINO, CALIFORNIA 91436

PAGA LETTER
GRIFOLS BIOLOGICALS INC.

95-241600

